

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Claims are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Formal Matters

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the priority document.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 5, 2001.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 1-5 are objected to because of certain informalities in claims 1, 2 and 3.

Claims 1, 2 and 3 are amended. Therefore, the objection to claims 1-5 should now be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because of allegedly indefinite terms in independent claim 1. Claims 2-5 are rejected solely because of their dependence from independent claim 1. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the terms in independent claim 1 to which the Examiner objects are not indefinite, and would have been readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art based on Applicant's disclosure. At most therefore, the grounds for

rejecting independent claim 1 cited by the Examiner amount to grounds for an objection.

Accordingly, no amendment is required as a matter of law or regulation.

However, in the interest of expediting prosecution of the present Application, Applicant amends independent claim 1 to remove the word "dual" before the word "node," and notes as follows. The following elucidations of claim terms cited by the Examiner are provided to shed light on the claim terms. It will be understood however, that these elucidations are not meant to be exhaustive of the range of interpretations of the terms or the possible embodiments of the invention. Further, while specific citations to Applicant's disclosure are provided to illustrate aspects of the cited claim terms, other portions of Applicant's disclosure may provide additional and/or different illustrations.

The term "object node" typically means a destination node (see for example, Fig. 6, Reference Numerals 605-606; Specification, page 9, lines 8-13).

Further, "disusing" a packet typically means that the packet is discarded or not transmitted by the node (see for example, Specification, page 10, lines 5-6).

Accordingly, the rejection should now be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding

this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "George Brieger".

George Brieger
Registration No.: 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
516-742-4343 Ext. 508

GB:kd